

REMARKS

Claims 7, 11-18, 20-31 and 34-42 are now pending in the application. Claims 11-16, 18-20, 21-24, 26-29 stand rejected. Claims 7, 17, 25, 30 and 31 have been previously withdrawn from consideration. Claims 8 and 9 have been previously cancelled, and Claims 1-6, 10, 19, 32 and 33 have been cancelled herein. Claims 11, 21 and 26 have been amended herein, and Claims 34-42 are new. Support for the amendments and the new claims can be found throughout the application, drawings and claims as originally filed and, as such, no new matter has been presented. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claims 11, 21 and 26 have been amended herein. Claim 11 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 19 and previously cancelled Claim 8. Claim 21 has been amended to include the subject matter of previously cancelled Claim 8. Claim 26 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 19. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added via these amendments.

ELECTION

Applicants note that the Examiner has additionally withdrawn Claims 1-6, 10, and 32-33 from consideration as being directed to a non-elected species. Applicants have cancelled Claims 1-6, 10 and 32-33 herein. Therefore, this election has been rendered moot.

Moreover, originally filed and elected Claim 8 (now canceled) recited, “disposing said porous laminated structure operably adjacent a structure to transpirationally cool said structure.” Claims 11, 21, and 34 now include subject matter similar to canceled Claim 8. Therefore, because Claim 8 was part of the originally elected Group I, Applicants submit that claims including subject matter directed to cooling a structure are also part of the elected invention. Thus, Claims 11, 21, and new Claim 34 are within the scope of the original election.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 11-16, 18-21, 23, 24 and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Damon et al. (G.B. Pat. No. 2323056; hereinafter "Damon"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, Applicants note Damon appears to disclose a composite panel 12 that is molded in a vacuum press under heat and pressure with a plurality of pins 13. The pins 13 are removed to form openings in the composite panel 12 and then the composite panel 12 is bonded to a honeycomb core cell component to complete an engine nacelle skin structure. The purpose of Damon's disclosure is to provide an engine nacelle skin structure with engine noise reduction, as the noise from the engine flows into the openings and enters the cells of the honeycomb core structure, which acts as an anechoic chamber to **redirect the noise back to the engine resulting in bi-directional flow** of air within the openings. In contrast, Applicants independent Claim 11 has been amended to recite:

placing a pin into the fabric stack said pin having a
selected profile such that said selected pore remaining in

said laminated structure allows for **substantially uni-directional flow of a flowable material through the laminated structure**;

* * *

cooling a structure with said uni-directional flow of said flowable material through said laminated structure (emphasis added).

Independent Claim 21 has been amended to recite:

...disposing said laminated structure against a structure; and

cooling said structure with said pores of said laminated structure (emphasis added).

Independent Claim 26 has been amended to recite:

...abolishing the pore-forming members in the laminated structure to form a plurality of uni-directional pores in said laminated structure that have **a selected profile to enable uni-directional flow of a flowable material through said laminated structure** (emphasis added).

In view of the above discussion, Applicants respectfully assert that Damon does not teach, suggest or disclose each and every element of Claims 11, 21 and 26. In this regard, Damon does not teach or suggest whatsoever a porous laminated structure for cooling an adjacent structure as claimed. Rather, Damon teaches a porous composite for channeling noise to an anechoic chamber. Applicants note it is improper to modify the composite panel 12 of Damon for cooling a structure, as Damon teaches the purpose of his invention is to channel noise to an anechoic chamber. Furthermore, Damon teaches away from the formation of **uni-directional pores**, and pores with a selected profile that enables **uni-directional flow**, as the object of the Damon disclosure is to provide pores that "reverse the [engine] noise back to the engine." Thus, Damon teaches the formation of **bi-directional pores** or pores that enable **bi-directional flow**.

Accordingly, in view of the above discussion, Applicants respectfully assert that Damon does not teach, suggest or disclose each and every element of Claims 11, 21 and 26, and as such, Applicants respectfully request the Office to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 11, 21 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

With regard to Claims 12-16, 18-20, 23, 24 and 27-29, Applicants note these claims depend directly or indirectly from either independent Claims 11, 21 or 26, and thus, should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth for Claims 11, 21 and 26 above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejections of Claims 12-16, 18-20, 23, 24 and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Damon et al. (GB 2323056; hereinafter "Damon"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to Claim 22, Applicants note that Claim 22 depends directly from Claim 21 and thus should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth for Claim 21, above. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

NEW CLAIMS

New claims 34-42 have been added. Applicants note that Claim 34 is directed towards the same subject matter as Claim 21, and includes the subject matter of previously cancelled Claim 8. In addition, Claims 35-42 include the same features as

original Claims 2-6 and 8-10. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that these new claims do not present issues of new matter, as support for these claims can be found in the specification, claims and drawings as filed. Further, Applicants respectfully assert, as discussed previously herein, that none of the cited references teach, suggest or disclose "disposing said laminated structure adjacent to a structure and cooling said structure through said pores formed in said laminated structure." In addition, none of the cited references teach, suggest or disclose "transpirationally cooling said structure" as claimed in new Claim 41 or "forming said porous structure with a hot wall and flowing a coolant through said pores to cool said hot wall" as claimed in Claim 42. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 34-42 are patentable over the cited art. Prompt and favorable consideration of the new claims are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3-12-07

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MLT/EKS/chs

By: 

Michael L. Taylor, Reg. No. 50,521
Erica K. Schaefer, Reg. No. 55,861